DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 247 213 SO 015 845

AUTHOR Bledstein, Burton J.
TITLE Discussing Terms: Professions, Professionals, Professionalism.
PUB DATE Apr 84
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Conference of the Organization of American History (Los Angeles, CA, April 1984).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cultural Context; Cultural Influences; *Definitions; *Historiography; Intellectual Disciplines; *Professional Occupations; *Professional Personnel; Social History; Social Influences; Social Systems; United States History
IDENTIFIERS Historians; Parsons (Talcott); *Professionalism

ABSTRACT

Throughout history there have always been confusion and even contradictions concerning professionalism. An occupation can be considered a profession in one country and not another, and in one historical period and not another. One contribution to this confusion is the explanation of the social system by Talcott Parsons and others, which has framed too narrowly and too cognitively the terms of the discussion of professions. Missing from this explanation were two of the most active cultural ingredients in the mixture of motives for professionalization. First, professionalism gave priority to the autonomous individual agent exhibiting a degree of creativity and personal independence of mind in social activity. Second, professionalism allowed a person to prepare in a context where the substance or content of a field could make an intrinsic difference in creating a professional identity, e.g., in medicine, disease composed such a content. To help answer the question "Who is a professional?", professional historians should give more attention to the cultural ambiguities internal to their own subject. (RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Burton J. Bledstein
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED247213

SO 015 845

Burton J. Bledstein, University of Illinois, Chicago

Discussing Terms: Professions, Professionals, Professionalism

Paper presented at the Conference of the Organization of American History (Los Angeles, CA April 1984)

"Who's a Professional? Who Cares?" asked a prominent historian nearly a decade ago. In the essay that followed the answer was shrewdly crafted. Because so many Americans have cared to call their occupational activity professional, few have succeeded in bringing to the concept a consistent and coherent interpretation. When nearly everyone "cares," from gamblers and killers to jet fighter jocks and physicians, the question "who's a professional" loses its seriousness of meaning. The criticism cut to the bone. It served to question the integrity of the historical field of inquiry. Ironically, if students of the professions can not find a coherent body of knowledge in the subject, a similarity of pattern, then they are using the concept falsely, that is unprofessionally.

Specific observations are not wanting in support of the critique. "Professional" and the family of related terms -- professions, professionalism, professionalization -- number among the most intensely used and powerfully evocative words in American English. Contemporary usage can accurately be described as both irrepressible and ubiquitous, in the computer industry and sports as well as in the traditional professions and the

academy. Who does not care, one might just as well ask? The 1983-84 Books in Print lists nearly 250 current titles in the subject covering a bewildering array of activities including "professional apartmenteering," professional imperialism in the Third World, and a professional guide for living with children. Specific professions included labor arbitration, poetry, photography, and consulting. For the year 1983, the Wall Street Journal featured individual examples of successful professionalism in such diverse fields as computer programming, stock market speculation, insurance adjusting, Fish and Game inspection, T.V. camera work, lobbying, nannying, accounting, and law. The portraits were not always flattering, but being professional always made a difference. Advertisers play heavily on the image. Marketing for professionalism in a commercial airline strives to evoke in the mind of the consumer qualities of consistency, a meticulous concern for everything that can be done, coolness under stress, and working for you, perhaps with a business computer whose tradename is The Professional. And in ordinary language Americans qualify a long list of processes by the phrase "professional": evaluation, socialization, training, preparation, advancement, achievement, applications, development, treatment. They qualify an equally long list of professional traits: secrets, standards, services, responsibilities, accountability, dominance, negligence, liability, obligations, techniques, strategies.

Nor is popular interest in this usage merely contemporary. In the later nineteenth century, baseball players, detectives, actors, and entertainers took pride in their professional status. Following the turn of the century articles in both popular and professional journals on aspects of professional activities appeared with accelerating rapidity. Interested writers did not confine the subject to the familiar, learned professions. Journalism, accountancy, business, administration, and letters entered an expanding orbit of discussion. In 1910, a book appeared on The Professional Aunt. In 1915 Abraham Flexner wrote: "Almost any occupation not obviously a business is apt to classify itself as a profession. Doctors, lawyers, preachers, musicians, engineers, journalists, trained nurses, trapeze and dancing masters, equestrians, and chiropodists -- all speak of their profession."

Following World War I and into the 1920s, a steady flow of articles and then books discussed the beneficial consequences of professional ethics for community and loyalty in modern society. Teacher's College, Columbia University in the 1920s and 1930s published numerous dissertations on the unending professional needs of primary and secondary schoolteachers, including at least one study of the hospital dietitian. In 1925 Sinclair Lewis, the son of a country doctor, won the Pulitzer Prize for Arrowsmith, a novel built on the tension between the heroic physician-scientist and the

crass commercialism and internal politics of the organized medical profession. Five years later, Dashiell Hammett etched the spare Sam Spade, the hard-boiled dick in The Maltese Falcon, a consummate "pro" in an ugly and perverted human universe. Built on fieldwork, Edwin Sutherland in 1937 documented a phenomenon named the professional thief, followed later by Howard Becker's study of professional jazz musicians, Carl Klockar's professional fence, and most recently, David Hayono's professional poker player.

II

Historically, what we have here is ambiguity and messiness -- an "other" -- lying outside the efforts to bring conceptual precision, order, location, and a magisterial voice to the subject. A richness of vocabulary, a rhetoric, a vernacular language, a way of speaking, a different sort of meaning about work, has grown up around professional activities. But we do not quite know how to fit this language into systems of cognitive authority formulated in terms of theorems, rules, symbolic structures, and patterns of conduct that have been the focus of scholarly attention for more than a generation.

We do not know how to take this vernacular language seriously. Why, for example, can the title "professor" historically address both a piano player in a brothel and a

university lecturer? It would appear that outside the decorum and the detachment of the official culture lived an unofficial one, irreverent, racy, scandalous, popular, and tempting, the "professor of desire" in Philip Roth's contemporary novel. In another example, how could John Dewey write as late as 1923 that amateur and professional were complementary types, and conclude that "we all develop in our schools what may be called the amateur professional." Dewey was not a second-rate mind shuffling over inconsistent notions. But in terms of our more recent understandings, his rhetoric seems confused.

The closer one looks at the ambiguities, the more confusion and even contradictions in the subject seem to prevail. An occupation can be considered a profession in one country and not another, and in one historical period and not another. Then arise the perplexities of distinguishing between a semi-profession and a profession, and client-oriented professions and colleague-oriented professions.

Few familiar characteristics of professionals, professions, and professionalization do not turn up ambiguity and counterexample. For example, where do expertise and esoteric knowledge belong in an understanding of professions? On the one hand, handwriting was called a field of expertise in the 19th century, as was public charity. Humanists trained in the classical texts took pride in their expertise, as did chess players in their mastery. On the other hand, the

historical record would seem to indicate that expertise does not assume primary significance in the professions until the 1930s.

The American concern with expertise has its own history, not necessarily parallel with the history of professional and academic interests. Expertise based on scientific bodies of knowledge has played a role in some professions but not necessarily a central one. Ruschmeyer and more recently Heinz and Laumann found, for example, that the law is not rooted in a scientific body of knowledge. One must look elsewhere -- to the status of clients -- in order to explain the prestige and authority of the legal profession. In many cases, such as that of the primary care physician who has traditionally related well to patients, the ignorance of clients and the technical expertise of physicians does not begin to explain the relationships between them.

The theoretical ideal of social service has been another celebrated characteristic of a powerful profession. However, the prestigious profession of law has failed to satisfy this standard. Popular historical attitudes towards law have often viewed it as a "parasitic service," and brought attention to the general atmosphere of futility surrounding legal codes of ethics. Old and enduring terms such as "Philadelphia lawyer," "shyster," "lip," "jackleg," "mouthpiece" and "hired gun" represent the mean spirit. Early technocratic utopians like Edward Bellamy, a lawyer himself

by training, explicitly selected lawyers for extinction. It is an enduring piece of Americana to read "liar" for "lawyer."

Though professionals pride themselves on explaining difficult matters, their greatest difficulty would seem to be in explaining themselves. In recent years the frustration by historians has flashed into view. Examples would be found not only in the query that opened this paper "Who's a Professional? Who cares?," but in sharp remarks like "Defining professionalization is a thankless task," or in a neo-positivist anti-theoretical mood that led one historian to conclude that etymology notwithstanding, professors are not professionals.

What then has fallen short in the subject? I suggest that it has not been <u>theory</u> itself; rather, it has been a particular explanation of the social system which has framed too narrowly and too cognitively the terms of the discussion of professions. Empirically speaking, expressions of cultural realities about professions have been richer and more believable than academics have recently thought. We require more receptive, imaginative, suppositions to begin to listen to the evidence, to realize the significance of the the "other" voices, and to reconstruct a world produced by a vernacular language.

III

Who reads or cares about Talcott Parsons more than a generation later? Not many, most would agree. Nevertheless, it is a tribute to Parsons that since World War II inroads into academic studies of the professions have a way of leading back to Parsonian concerns with the order, authority, legitimation, and dependencies within a modern social system: the frame within which the professions have been examined. In the 1950s and 1960s, Merton, Barber, Caplow, Hughes, Shils, Goode, Ben David, a host of additional sociologists, and several historians of the Progressive era, notably Lubove and Wiebe, sympathetically expanded upon Parsonian formulations of the professional model.

Though that model turned problematic in the 1970s, it was important to the critics that it remain intact, often a silent presence when confronted by the very real historical particulars of gender, race, ethnic, religious, economic, and class biases in elitist professional conduct.
Critics held up the Parsonian system of professional meritocracy and emphasized the inherent conflicts of interests Parsons himself had blunted, antagonisms between the professional, the scientific or disciplinary, the public, and the proprietary. A separate essay needs to be written delineating these four spheres and their interaction.

"Collectivity" in Parsons turned into a dead-level of administrative bureaucracy in C. Wright Mills, into

occupational hierarchy and market control in Larson, into monopoly, exclusion, and privilege in Friedson and Collins who minimized the skills of technical competence and specificity of function in the professions any more than in other occupations. Ohmann viewed the concern with elite status in the professions as the nearest thing in bourgeois society to title and rank. Those close in perspective to the Frankfurt School like Christopher Lasch saw in the professions a spectacle of knowledge, a presentation of false universals in a bourgeois ideology that terminated rationality in the "incorporation" of authoritarian social forms. Professionalism shared in a "hegemonic" culture of consumption. By means of the skills of public impression management, professionals promoted the unreality of personal ideals like autonomy, self-control, and mastery whle serving to conceal the reality of private, corporate power. "Collectivity" in Parsons turned into a public relations conspiracy in T.J. Jackson Lears, a game bourgeois politicians excelled at.

Without engaging this mixed body of social criticism and historiography, I wish only to make a point relevant to the current argument. While rejecting Parsons's value judgements, the critics nevertheless took for granted his intellectual categories. We need to move beyond them.

First, in an array of mechanistic metaphors Parsons described professional roles as vehicles, mechanisms,

instruments, or means to reduce, moderate, buffer, or mitigate strains, pressures, and instabilities in the social system. The social system stood at the center of Parson's intellectualized universe, a text of idealized normative spatial arrangements of power. Neither Parsons nor his critics focused attention on professions as substantive for their own sake, as inherently worthy of interest. Neither showed concern with the nature of professional knowledge: as if no one would be interested in the content itself of professional training rather than the form or the structure, or as if no one should be persuaded of the validity of professional services.

Professional roles served another master. For Parsons they made possible the socialization of deviancy, they legitimized controlled behavior, and represented institutionalized order in a mass society. For the critics, reverse judgments came into play. Professional roles made possible the deviancy of socialization at the highest levels of power and wealth. Those roles legitimized privilege, legally sanctioned opportunity in the upper middle class, certified an elite selected by qualities other than merit, and legally put in place institutions served by professionals that made ordinary citizens pay for a social system that did not work for them.

Second, the polyphonic historical context that preceded Parsons gave way to the social scientist's universalized

text. Parsons succeeded in purifying the subject by narrowing the professional sphere to technical expertise learned in a higher school, an academic setting. He rid the subject of past controversy and conflicting visions by shifting attention away from social ethics to institutionalized rules, away from social reform to collective normalization, away from professional practice to technical authority, away from clients to the idealized community of colleagues. A variety of organizational patterns with no single one serving as a model for others have appeared in American professions. Parsonian social structures were sufficient to understand the general role of academic discipline in regulating powerful modern professions. From bottom to top, Parsons ranked the normative world hierarchically: from the popular to the professional, from the emotional to the cognitive, from the local to the cosmopolitan, from the traditional to the modern, from the individual to the collective, from the practical to the competent.

Cognitive, cosmopolitan, modern, collective, competent: these ideal-types were geared to convince the convinced, the insiders, the purely professional. Charlatans satisfy clients, Everett C. Hughes remarked, professionals satisfy their colleagues. In the new model, professionals spoke only to each other, sheltered from the thicket of associated meanings and value judgements in the wider culture in which

they lived and worked. Only colleagues secure within the boundaries of hermeneutic communities, invisible colleges, and a system of theory could take each other seriously. Parsonian sociology took the discussion of the professions out of an ethnocentric context and a vernacular language, and placed it within a generalized vocabulary of social mechanics: consensus and conflict, equilibrium and breakdown, meritocracy and mass culture, order and anarchy. Parsons assumed as a matter of logical consistency that the professional phenomenon could not be analyzed in a popular or common currency. He emphasized the point by means of the heaviness and formality of his own literary style -- a dense style addressed to a cognoscente and punctuated by a spirit of finality, completion, and accomplishment.

In a context of professional persuasion and performance, colleagues have played against each other and clients because the former have monopolized something more valuable than cognitive rationality and technical expertise in a field of competency, more powerful than skill and social organization. What is sufficient within a social system may not be necessary within a culture. Clients and colleagues themselves, displaying the intensity of persons who care too much, have trusted, feared, respected, maligned, obeyed, abused, affirmed and denied professional claims by each other. Parsons domesticated professional roles, normalized them, took for granted their authority in social systems, and

in the end falsified those roles. Routine matters do not get professionalized, and that would include a most important dimension of the professional role. Professional services have to do with human affairs not easily diagnosed, understood, altered, or tamed. Those services have not been commonsensical. On the contrary, professional services have been rendered in circumstances where reality seemed not to be rational and could not be taken for granted. Moving beyond the descriptions of the social structure of professional norms, controls, systems, and ideas, we need to arrive at the values which informed the cultural substance of professional authority.

IV

Characterizing a vernacular language, Wittgenstein offered the following metaphor.

> Do not be troubled by the fact that languages consist only of orders. If you want to say that this language is complete; -- whether it was so before the symbolism of chemistry and the notation of the infinitesimal calculus were incorporated in it; for these are, so to speak, suburbs of our language. (And how many houses or streets does it take before a town begins to be a town?) Our language can be seen as an ancient city: a maze of little streets and squares, of

> old and new houses, and of houses with additions from various periods; and this surrounded by a multitude of new boroughs with straight regular streets and uniform houses.

In the chronology of American history, professions both preceded the division of labor, licensing, and scientific bodies of knowledge, and they originated in part from activities other than the learned professions. One must seriously consider that suburban structures, so to speak, never completely displaced the "ancient" city's bits and pieces of eccentric and often satirical meanings which continued to map understandings long after their original appearance. The common, mocking, irreverent references to "professor" in the American idiom, for instance, have never ceased both to deflate the pomposity of the official cultural type and to intensify the sway of mental power over clients. Democratizing "professor," popularizing it -- vulgarizing said the purists -- enhanced rather than diminished or diluted the meaning of the word, even though academics felt slandered.

When examining an historical subject, however specialized, scholars must heed the contemporary usage of language. The richness of the historical lexicon of related words such as profession, professional, unprofessional, professor, professionalism, professionalization, expert, layman, amateur, empiric, common sense, impostor, quack, charlatan, mountebank, and confidence man both fascinates and

instructs the observer. Though related to each other in a thicket of meanings, each word came into use separately, had a dissimilar historical existence, and accumulated meanings that shifted marginally but significantly over time. As enmeshed within a particular web of rhetorical associations, each generation in America since the late eighteenth century has understood the professional phenomena from a slightly different axis of expressed reality.

It is important to tell, for instance, at what point in historical time -- and why -- the use of "profession" accumulated secular interpretations beyond the original religious meanings? When and why did the professional practitioner become prominent in addition to the professor who declared a vow and opinion? When and why emerged "professionals" who belonged to no obvious profession? When and why did "unprofessional" come into vogue? When and why did "professionalism" bring controversy and pejorative reference to the surface? When and why did "empiric" become more positive after earlier negative affiliations?

For an illustration, observe uses of the terms "amateur" and "professional." Both terms first appeared as important words in the context of sports and theater in the later part of the nineteenth century, not in the context of the learned professions earlier in the century. "Amateurs" played for pleasure, sometimes brilliantly. They performed for the satisfaction of inspiration and inclination, often

successfully. They strived for fellowship, compassion, and civility, always worthy ends. But amateurs did not profess to get a job done, to master a practise by having confidence in one's ability. An amateurish performance could neither be reliable nor sure in its proficiency, with a consistently winning performance.

It was significant that professional performers were plebeian, and usually performed before urban audiences. Strangers to each other, the members of those audiences shared a common interest in activities where surprise, accident, luck, disguise, costuming, and license created both the delight of suspense and the shock of disappointment. The ball took unexpected bounces, anything could suddenly happen in the urban theater of baseball and vaudeville, not unlike life on the streets. Customers and clients "trusted" the "pro" to come through under the stress of perverse circumstances, to save the messy situation, to take pride in an accomplished act, to succeed -- no matter how. The "pro" operated in a theater of problems that more often appeared to be trivial than weighty. The skilled "pro" could take on any job -- no matter what -- so long as the perversity of life itself threatened, and both common sense and the unaided senses of the amateur were unsteady. The professional showed the nerve to wait and strike at the right moment, to take the job more seriously than ordinary domestic life allowed, to act on risks by figuring out the odds, to call nonsense by

its right name, and to show good judgement in a world in which anything goes. In the 1930s, for instance, Sutherland's professional thief displayed pride in his work by not bungling the job and physically harming the "mark," by not victimizing the struggling ordinary guy, unlike the less trustworthy, the unproficient, and often dishonest municipal authorities. Some irony!

What did the "pro" share with the schooled professional, one may ask? Certainly it was not a concern with disciplined knowledge or professional organization. Meanings, however, mixed in the stream of social exchanges, spilled over from one arena to the next, colored each other. The "pro" performed for clients, by acting upon the precariousness of existence, by confronting perversity in situations. The schooled professional acquired cultural authority by persuading clients to accept advice about specific and enduring threats to existence, by naming evil. The "pro" acted to create suspense and resolve mystery. The schooled professional trained in order to diagnose sources of harm and and to prevent the worst.

V

The learned professions in the first part of the nineteenth century had cornered rational causation in the universe. They both fitted observation into harmonious

designs that were all-encompassing and made claims for influence far beyond the limited confines of a given competence. Popular expectations for human performance were rising in late nineteenth-century America, and schooled professionals began naming subjects which were intrinsically unstable, eluding speculation and control by a superior rationality. Modern professionals practised at the limits of rationality, at the clinical edge of theoretical science.

The pain in disease, the uncanny dimension to knowledge, or more particularly, the gamble in surgery, uncertainty in the law courts, the strangeness of the city, the transformations of the American frontier, the emotional needs of savages, the repressions of the psyche, the fluidity of money: such were examples of the spheres of risk where clinical evaluation was not easily scoffed at or insulted, where a schooled profession formed for its patrons a vocabulary by which to understand their experience and needs. Within a growing body of information that rejected ordinary common sense, the successful profession defined not only the very wants that it served but its mistakes that could prove harmful. The physician, for instance, characterized an intellectual construction called a sickness for a patient who was then persuaded to accept the construction and trust an opinion on the dangers of non-treatment versus treatment. By possessing the sovereignty to invent the names for diseases and the names for therapies, a schooled profession like

medicine became powerful culturally. Physicians professed confidence in their skills both to diagnose and to alter the natural course of pathologies, to provide treatments within the privacy of an office and hospital, to control the language of discourse, and to influence the popular imagery for sickness that fascinated the middle-class imagination. In America, schooled professions presented a way of thinking about the darker and more controversial aspects of middle-class culture that were admissible in no other way.

Since Talcott Parsons began publishing in the later 1930s, the historiography on professionalization in the Progressive era has gravitated away from cultural motives and towards an emphasis on the logical development and incorporation of vocational systems. Parsons offered a perspective that gave priority to social engineering and control, social scientific paradigms, untainted commitments, and objective expertise. Missing from this structural perspective were two of the most active cultural ingredients in the mixture of motives for professionalization in the first part of the American twentieth century.

First, one need look no further than to the new University of Chicago, to George Herbert Mead in social psychology and Robert Park in sociology, to witness a meaning in the value of professionalism that gave priority to the autonomous individual agent exhibiting a degree of creativity and personal independence of mind in social activity. The

priority here was not given to tightly drawn academic disciplines with close definitions of boundaries. Mead, for instance, built a theory of social psychology on the social basis of individual behavior. But he did not suppress individual consciousness and choice, the importance of the sense of personal effectiveness within functional social processes. In Mead's image, the professionally active scientist -- methodical, critical, competent to act with a definite technique in a specific field -- achieved that "independence of mind and self which every one legitimately craves." Inuependence of mind, independence of judgement, social independence, intellectual independence: these were the phrases Mead repeated with conviction when he spoke of the value of professional activity. His commitment to the self was strenuously middle class. By lacking trained competence to make intelligent judgments, the amateur needed to depend on others, thereby failing to develop the "fundamental self respect on which one builds" to reach "the fullest normal development" required to face "real relations" in the clinic of life.

In that clinic of life, Robert Park assumed the professional attitude of the actor, performer, and participant involved in the vernacular. Park's professional was an urban player who proposed to take a walk on the wild side of the wide-open city both in order to make it academically intelligible and to work for liberalism's moral

community. The academic as actor, the intervening stranger, entered upon the mutable and visceral stage of urban social problems, where all experience went by indirection and all scholarly results were gained by conflict and resistance. This was no place either for well-intentioned amateurs or for purely cerebral professors. The complexities of human behavior in the metropolis, the varieties of human duplicity, the emotional interaction, were more than either sentiment or a passive looking-glass theory of self could ever account for. Nevertheless, by the 1930s, Park's pluralism, his contemporary understanding of Simmel, James, and Dewey, his commitment to activity, his lack of a formalistic detachment from the object of scrutiny, gave way to social science statistics as practiced by William Ogburn at Chicago and to system-making as presented by Parsons at Harvard.

Second, institutional and intellectual forms, processes, mechanisms, and systems are inadequate to explain why professionalization in one field and not another interested Americans in the early twentieth century. Schooled practitioners <u>trained</u> for their work by learning more than logic, method, and the current body of knowledge. They also <u>prepared</u> in a context where the substance or content of a field could make an intrinsic difference in creating a professional identity. In medicine, disease composed such a content. In the humanistic social sciences, for example -- Park's city, F.J. Turner's American frontier, Franz Boas's

ethnographic native American culture, Wesley Clair Mitchell's money, and I would add, Freud's psychoanalysis -- each was more than a codified system of ideas. In expectant middle-class America, each was an unruly continent, out of scale, where knowledge was problematic and authorized truths were unconvincing. A participant observer and reliable craftsman was called upon to transform brute experience in a changing, frightful region into a persuasive scientific analysis.

The substance of these spheres of "otherness," Turner's Western Frontier for instance, served to generate both metaphor and myth in new professions. In a period of trial and testing following formal studies rites of passage were undergone on a "frontier." Professional rites of passage were more than mechanisms of socialization. The rite was about something felt to be deeply real in the world. At its most self-conscious, it required a candidate to break off sharply from familiar inquiry and surroundings and be interned on foreign ground -- the urban jungle, the tribal village, the would-be psychoanalysts own "interminable" interior -- where the incredible native point of view was irrepressible and the initiate's routine defenses and even disgust were overcome only with difficulty and never completely. Indeed, the epistemological misgivings created by being immersed in an overflowing stream of exotic information and personally feeling the urgency to get to the heart of the subject in a limited duration of time, to bring analytic

order out of experiential chaos, was nerve-wracking. The successful candidate returned home from the field significancly altered, having paid the dues, and prepared as the insider outsider in normal society to practise a skill by engaging special problems.

Who's a professional? Who cares? The terms embracing professionalism in the American vocabulary have expressed serious cultural values for a long time. Yet meaning in the subject with its depths in the vernacular has remained unruly, at times frighteningly so. Freud called psychoanalysis an "impossible" profession because in it "one can be quite sure of unsatisfying results." With his bourgeois patients in mind, he concluded that the object of analysis,

> will be not to rub off all the corners of the human character so as to produce 'normality' according to schedule, nor yet to demand that the person who has been 'thoroughly analysed' shall never again feel the stirrings of passions in himself or become involved in any internal conflict. The business of analysis is to secure the best possible psychological conditions for the functioning of the ego; when this has been done, analysis has accomplished its task.

In order to acomplish their task, professional historians of the professions in American society would find it useful to

give more attention to the cultural ambiguities internal to their own subject.

Notes

1. Laurence Veysey, "Who's a Professional? Who Cares," Reviews in American History, III (1975), 419-23. See also, Veysey, "The Plural Organized World of the Humanities," in Alexandra Oleson and John Voss (eds.), The Organization of Knowledge in Modern America, 1860-1920 (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979), pp. 57-63.

2. Wall Street Journal, "Culture Shock Affects Steelworker Who Switched to White-Collar Job," June 1, 1983; "Trading Bell," November 22, 1983; "In Wake of Alicia, Adjusters Face Snakes, Heat, Testy Homeowners," August 30, 1983; "A Fish-and-Game Man with a Ph.D .Battles for Wyoming Wildlife," June 21, 1983; "TV Camerman's Job is a Stimulating Blend of the Trivial and Scary," June 22, 1983; "A University is Hoping to Clean Up the Image of a Very Old Profession," March 24, 1983; "Big 8 Accounting Firm is Blamed by Small one for all of its Troubles," July 28, 1983; "Lawyers' Public Image is Dreadful, Spurring concern by Attorneys" October 11, 1983.

3. Mary C. Wemyss, The Professional Aunt, (Boston & New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1910).

4. Abraham Flexner, "Is Social Work a Profession," Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections (Chicago, Illinois, 1915), 577.

5. See, "The Ethics of the Professions and of Business," American Academy of Political and Social Science: Annals CI (May, 1922), 1-300; Carl Frederick Taeusch, Professional and Business Ethics (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1926). A significant audience in America read R.H. Tawney, The Acquisitive Society (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1920) and Sidney and Beatrice Webb, "Special Supplement on Professional Associations," in The New Statesman, IX (Saturday, April 21, 1917), 1-48.

6. For example, Alfred L. Hall-Quest, Professional Secondary Education in Teachers Colleges (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1925); Willis B. Coale, The Professional Needs of Teachers of English (New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1928); Charles Willis Boardman, Professional Tests as Measures of Teaching Efficiency in High School (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928); Helen Clarke, The Professional Training of the Hospital Dietitian (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1934).

7. Sinclair Lewis, Arrowsmith, (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1925); The Novels of Dashiell Hammett, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965), pp. 293-440.

8. Edwin H. Sutherland, The Professional Thief; by a Professional Thief (Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 1937); Howard S. Becker, "The Professional Dance Musician and his Audience," American Journal of Sociology, LVII (September, 1951), 136-44; Howard S. Becker, Outsiders;

Studies in the Sociology of Deviance (New York, London: The Free Press, 1963); Carl B. Klockars, The Professional Fence (New York: The Free Press, 1974); David M. Hayano, Poker Faces: The Life and Work of Professional Card Players (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1982).

9. H.L. Mencken, The American Language (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1937), pp. 272-3; N.R.L., "The Title Professor," American Speech, III (October, 1927), 27; Charles L. Hanson, "'Professor' Again," Op. cit. III (February, 1928), 256-7; Mamie Meredith, "'Professor' or 'Professional'?" Op. cit. IX (February, 1934), 71-2.

10. Philip Roth, The Professor of Desire (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1977).

11. John Dewey, "Culture and Professionalism in Education," School and Society, XVIII (October 13, 1923), 424.

12. See Barry D. Karl, "Philanthropy, Policy Planning, and the Bureaucratization of the Democratic Ideal," Daedalus 105 (Fall, 1976), 129-149; Barry D. Karl, Charles E. Merriam and the Study of Politics (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974).

13. Dietrich Rueschemeyer, "Doctors and Lawyers: A Comment on the Theory of the Professions," Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology I (1964), 17-30; John B. Heinz and Edward O. Laumann, Chicago Lawyers: The Social Structure of the Bar (New York & Chicago: Russell Sage Foundation &

American Bar Foundation, 1982).

14. Paul Starr, The Social Transformation of American Medicine: The Rise of a Sovereign Profession and the Making of a Vast Industry (New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1982), pp. 78-144; George Rosen, The Structure of American Medical Practise, 1875-1941 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983); Terence J. Johnson, Professions and Power (London: Macmillan, 1972), p. 35.

15. Donald G. Baker, "The Lawyer in Popular Fiction," Journal of Popular Culture, III (1969-70), 493-516; Jerold S. Auerbach, Unequal Justice: Lawyers and Social Change in Modern America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976); Edward Bellamy, Looking Backward, 2000-1887 (Riverside Edition: Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin Company, n.d.), pp. 202-5; Kenneth M. Roemer, The Obsolete Necessity: America in Utopian Writings, 1888-1900 (Kent, Ohio, The Kent State University Press, 1976), pp. 145-6.

16. Nathan Reingold, "Definitions and Speculations: The Professionalization of Science in America in the Nineteenth Century," Alexandra Oleson and Sanborn C. Brown (eds.), The Pursuit of Knowledge in the Early American Republic: American Scientific and Learned Societies from Colonial Times to the Civil War (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976), p. 34; Charles Rosenberg, "Toward an Ecology of Knowledge: on Discipline, Context, and History," Alexandra Oleson and John Voss (eds.), The Organization of Knowledge in Modern America, 1860-1920) (Baltimore and London: The Johns

Hopkins University Press, 1979), pp. 440-55. For a critical response see, Thomas L. Haskell, "Are Professors Professional?" Journal of Social History XIV (Spring, 1981), 485-93.

17. There is no adequate review of this literature. See, Joseph Ben-David, "Professions in the Class System of Everyday Society," Current Sociology, XII (1963-4), 247-98. More recently, see, Matthew Ramsey, "Review Essay: History of a Profession, Annales Style: The Work of Jacques Leonard," Journal of Social History XVII (Winter, 1983), 319-38.

18. On gender, for example, see Joan Jacobs Brumberg and Nancy Tomes, "Women in the Professions: A Research Agenda for American Historians," Reviews in American History X (June, 1982), 275-96; Rosalind Rosenberg, Beyond Separate Spheres: Intellectual Roots of Modern Feminism (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1982). On selective bias in higher education, see Harold S. Wechsler, The Qualified Student: a History of Selective College Admission in America John Wiley & Sons, 1977); Marcia Graham Synnott, The Half-Opened Door: Discrimination and Admisssions at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, 1900-1970 (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1979). See also, Christopher Jencks, et. al., Who Gets Ahead: The Determinants of Economic Success in America (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1979).

19. C. Wright Mills, White Collar: The American Middle Class (New York: Oxford University Press, 1951), pp. 112-41; Magali Sarfatti Larson, The Rise of Professionalism: a

Sociological Analysis (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1977); Eliot Freidson, Profession of Medicine: a Study of the Sociology of Applied Knowledge (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1970); Randall Collins, The Credential Society: an Historical Sociology of Education and Stratification (New York: Academic Press, 1979); Richard Ohmann, English in America: a Radical View of the Profession (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976). See also Alvin W. Gouldner, The Future of Intellectuals and the Rise of the New Class (New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1979).

20. From the Frankfurt School, see Theodor W. Adorno, "The Sociology of Knowledge and Its Consciousness," The Essential Frankfurt School Reader (eds.) Andrew Arato & Eike Gebhardt (New York: Urizen Books, 1978), 452-65; Jurgen Habermas, "Technology and Science as 'Ideology,'" Toward a Rational Society: Student Protest, Science, and Politics (Boston: Beacon Press, 1970), pp. 81-127. Christopher Lasch, Haven in a Heartless World: The Family Beseiged (New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1977).

21. T.J. Jackson Lears, "From Salvation to Self-Realization: Advertising and the Therapeutic Roots of the Consumer Culture, 1880-1930," Richard Wightman Fox and T.J. Jackson Lears (eds.), The Culture of Consumption: Critical Essays in American History, 1880-1980) (New York: Pantheon Books, 1983), pp. 1-38.

22. See Talcott Parsons, Essays in Sociological Theory

(Rev. ed. New York: The Free Press, 1954), pp. 34-49, 370-85; Parsons, The Social System (New York: The Free Press, 1951), pp. 335-48, 428-79.

23. For an interpretative use of the model, see Andrew Abbott, "Status and Status Strain in the Professions," American Journal of Sociology 86 (1981), 819-35.

24. For a comment on stylistic discipline in the social sciences, see Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (Rev. New York: The Free Press, 1957), pp. 13-4.

25. Ludwig Wittgenstein, Philosophical Investigations trans. G.E. Anscombe (New York: Macmillan, 1953), p. 8.

26. Numerous editions of American Dictionaries -- Webster, Worcester, Century, Funk & Wagnalls -- appeared regularly in 19th century America, in addition to dictionaries of Americanisms -- Bartlett, DeVere, Farmer -- and slang dictionaries. For historians, these editions constitute a useful but seldom consulted source for invesigation.

27. On vaudeville, see Albert F. McLean, Jr., American Vaudeville as Ritual (University of Kentucky Press, 1965). Gunther Barth, City People: The Rise of Modern City Culture in Nineteenth Century America (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980) describes the popular reception of professional performances.

28. Sutherland, Professional Thief, Op. cit.

29. See Edmund D. Pellegrino, "The Sociological Impact of Twentieth-Century Therapeutics," and Charles E. Rosenberg,

"The Therapeutic Revolution: Medicine, Meaning, and Social Change in Nineteenth-Century America," in Morris J. Vogel, Charles E. Rosenberg (eds.), The Therapeutic Reolution: Essays in the Social History of Medicine (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1979), pp. 245-66, 3-25.

30. The most recent study is Starr, The Social Transformation of American Medicine, Op. cit.

31. This literature is substantial. For some landmarks see Robert H. Wiebe, The Search for Order, 1877-1920 (New York: Hill and Wang, 1967); Jerry Israel (ed.), Building the Organization Society: Essays on Associational Activities in Modern America (New York: The Free Press, 1972); Stephen Skowronek, Building a New American State: The Expansion of National Administrative Capacities, 1877-1920 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982). See also Don S. Kirschner, "'Publicity Properly Applied': The Selling of Expertise in America, 1900-1929," American Studies XIX (Spring, 1978), 65-78. In an influential work, Thomas Haskell, The Emergence of Professional Social Science: The American Social Science Association and the Nineteenth Century Crisis of Authority Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1977) developed a modified Parsonian point of view. In criticism of the direction of the historiography see Wayne K. Hobson, "Professionals, Progressives and Bureaucratization: a Reassessment, The Historian XXXIX (August, 1977), 639-58. For a recent different perspective on the era, see David I. Macleod, Building Character in the American Boy: The Boy

Scouts, YMCA, and their Forerunners, 1870-1920 (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1983).

32. Mead quoted in Steven J. Diner, "George Herbert Mead's Ideas on Women and Careers: a Letter to his Daughter-in-Law, 1920," Signs 4 (1978), 408-9. See also Steven J. Diner, "Department and Discipline: the Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago, 1892-1920," Minerva XIII (Winter, 1975), 514-53; Rosenberg, Beyond Separate Spheres, Op. cit., pp. 137-8.

33. In addition to Park's own essays, my interpretation of Park draws on Fred H. Matthews, Quest for an American Sociology: Robert E. Park and the Chicago School (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1977).

34. Historians of anthropology are currently examining this theme in of English ethnography. See Carol Ann Parssinen, "Social Explorers and Social Scientists: The Dark Continent of Victorian Ethnography," in Jay Ruby (ed.), A Crack in the Mirror: Refexive Perspectives in Anthropology (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982), pp. 205-17; George W. Stocking, Jr., "The Ethnographer's Magic: Fieldwork in British Anthropology from Tylor to Malinowski," in George W. Stocking, Jr. (ed.), Observers Observed: Essays on Ethnographic Fieldwork (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1983), pp. 70-120; James Clifford, "On Ethnographic Authority," Representations I (Spring, 1983), 118-145.

35. Sigmund Freud, "Analysis Terminable and Interminable," Therapy and Technique ed. Philip Rieff (New York: Collier Books, 1963), pp. 268, 266.